

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

**CWP-COM No.171 of 2017
Date of Decision:24.05.2017**

Shingara Singh
vs.

.....Petitioner

Kotak Mahindra Bank Ltd. and anotherRespondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAKESH KUMAR JAIN

Present: Mr. S.D. Bansal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Rakesh Kumar Jain (Oral)

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and perused the record.

If the petitioner is aggrieved against order dated 22.4.2016 passed by respondent No.11 on an application filed under Section 14 of the Securitization and Reconstruction of Financial Assets and Enforcement of Security Interest Act, 2002 (for short, 'the Act'), then the petitioner has remedy before the DRAT and if the petitioner is alleging that the respondent has taken possession by forging the documents then the remedy lies with the petitioner to approach the Civil Court where the issue of forgery would be adjudicated. The writ petition is thus not maintainable.

Dismissed.

May 24, 2017
renu

(Rakesh Kumar Jain)
Judge

Whether Speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No